

Application No. 09/449,699
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

R E M A R K S

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

THE CLAIMS

Claims 12 and 17 (and corresponding computer program storage medium claims 19 and 21) have been amended to clarify the features of the present invention whereby the document processing apparatus comprises judging means for judging whether a virtual printer or an actual printer is designated when a printing process operation of document data is selected, and print control means for printing said document data on the actual printer when said judging means judges that the actual printer is designated, and whereby virtual document data is created for document data when the virtual printer is designated. See the disclosure in the specification at, for example, page 12, lines 4-16 and page 18, line 8 - page 15, line 8).

In addition, claim 13 has been amended to better accord with amended independent claim 12.

No new matter has been added, and it is respectfully requested that the amendments to claims 12, 13, 17, 19 and 21 be approved and entered.

Application No. 09/449,699
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

THE PRIOR ART REJECTION

Claims 12, 17, 19, and 21 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of the combination of USP 6,327,599 B1 (previously cited "Warmus et al") and USP 6,480,866 (previously cited "Mastie"), and claims 13 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of the combination of Warmus et al, and Mastie, and USP 5,588,103 (previously cited "Aoyagi") or USP 6,470,363 (previously cited "Kanerva et al"). These rejections, however, are respectfully traversed with respect to the claims as amended hereinabove.

Independent claims 12, 17, 19 and 21 have been amended to more clearly distinguish between designating an actual printer and designating a virtual printer.

According to the present invention as recited in amended independent claims 12, 17, 19 and 21, if an actual printer is designated when selecting a printing process for document data, then the document data is printed.

However, when a virtual printer is designated, the document data is obtained as virtual document data (claims 12 and 19), or the document data is converted into a drawing record so as to form virtual document data (claims 17 and 21). And according to the claimed present invention, once the virtual document data has been created from a plurality of different types of application programs and stored, individual pages are selected from virtual

Application No. 09/449,699
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

document data from the different application programs and are arranged in an arbitrarily selected order. The individual pages from the various application programs are then outputted in the new order.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited references relate only to designating an actual printer as an output destination for print data.

The Examiner continues to contend that the bitmap conversion of Warmus et al corresponds to the designation of a virtual printer according to the present invention. As recited in the amended independent claims, however, the designation of an actual printer and the designation of a virtual printer are clearly two different designations that result in two different outcomes (immediate output for printing in the case of designating an actual printer, and the creation and editing of virtual document data in the case of designating a virtual printer).

As pointed out in the Amendment filed on April 14, 2005, the bitmap creation of Warmus et al is achieved by sending data to an actual printing system to print data. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the bitmap creation of Warmus et al merely corresponds to the conventional operation of selecting an actual printer and printing document data.

On page 7 of the Office Action, moreover, the Examiner asserts that the conversion of a WordPerfect (.wpd) document into

Application No. 09/449,699
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

a Word (.doc) document and renumbering of pages in the newly created Word document corresponds to the renumbering of pages of document data created by different application programs as recited in claims 12 and 19.

It is respectfully pointed out, however, that according to the claimed present invention, the editing of virtual document data takes place only after a virtual printer has been designated when selecting a printing process operation such that virtual document data is created.

By contrast, according to the Examiner's suggested example using WordPerfect and Word documents, no designation of any printer (virtual or actual) is involved before the conversion of the WordPerfect document into the Word document or the renumbering of pages. It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the Examiner's example of converting a WordPerfect document into a Word document is completely unrelated to the claimed present invention.

It is again respectfully pointed out that, as explained in the Amendment filed on April 14, 2005, the processing described in Warmus et al at column 8, lines 9-12, column 8, line 57 to column 9, line 3 and column 9, lines 57-59, which the Examiner contends corresponds to the processing of the virtual document data of the claimed present invention, all takes place before the bitmap data is created. That is, this processing of Warmus et al

Application No. 09/449,699
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

is performed before the bitmap data (that is, what the Examiner contends is "virtual document data" in Warmus et al) is even created.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention as recited in amended independent claims 12, 13, 17, 19 and 21, and claim 18 depending from claim 17, now clearly patentably distinguishes over all of the cited references, taken singly or in any combination, under 35 USC 103.

* * * * *

Entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas Holtz
Reg. No. 33,902

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.
220 Fifth Avenue - 16th Floor
New York, NY 10001-7708
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900
DH:al/iv